



*Mission Permanente
de la République Islamique d'Iran
auprès des Nations Unies
et des autres Organisations Internationales à Genève*

In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful

Ref. 2050/3029412

The Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva presents its compliments to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and with reference to the UA IRN 14 / 2026 dated 22 July 2026 enclosed with the Joint Urgent Appeal from Special Procedures, has the honor to transmit herewith, comments from the High Council for Human Rights of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights the assurances of its highest consideration.

Geneva, 04 September 2026



Office of the United Nations
High Commissioner for Human Rights
Palais des Nations
CH-1211 Geneva 10
Emails: registry@ohchr.org

In the Name of God

The Islamic Republic of Iran, while presenting its highest respect, in response to the correspondence dated July 22, 2026, of the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council with reference number UA IRN 14/2026, regarding Mr. Shervin Bagherian-Jebeli, announces the following for consideration and comment:

The Islamic Republic of Iran, while respecting the mandates assigned to the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council and emphasizing the importance of constructive interaction and dialogue in the field of human rights, wishes to emphasize, before entering into the issues at hand, the necessity of distinguishing between official information obtained from judicial processes and secondary information or media reports. A significant part of the contents contained in the present correspondence are presented with phrases such as "it is reported" and "it appears" and are based on information that has been made available to the Special Procedures. Obviously, a thorough assessment of a criminal case, especially one that involves multiple charges and complex judicial aspects, requires consideration of official information and documentation available to the competent judicial authorities.

Accordingly, the Islamic Republic of Iran, while rejecting any perception or conclusion based on inaccurate information, declares its readiness to provide the necessary explanations within the framework of existing mechanisms and relevant jurisdictions.

1. Regarding the events in Alikhani Square, the number of defendants and the method of judicial proceedings

First, it is necessary to correct some of the information contained in the present correspondence regarding the case of the events in Shahid Alikhani Square in Isfahan. Contrary to the information cited in the correspondence and the number of defendants in this case being 59, according to official information from the Isfahan Provincial Justice Department, the total number of defendants in the case was 47. Of this number, the charges of 34 adult defendants were under the jurisdiction of the Islamic Revolution Court of Isfahan, and the other defendants were tried in the Children and Juvenile Court according to their age. It is necessary to explain that the Revolution Court, which is a specialized court, has a president and two advisors who are formed in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, and the rulings issued in it are subject to appeal in the provincial courts and appeal to the Supreme Court. Therefore, it is expected that the use of the false term "Revolutionary Court" in future correspondence will be avoided.

No:

Date:

The results of the investigation of the adult defendants were also not the same. The case of one person is still open due to a lack of investigation, two people were acquitted, one person was sentenced to one year in prison and 12 people were sentenced to death, and the other convicts were sentenced to five years in prison, with one-quarter of their prison terms deducted in accordance with the relevant regulations, considering that they submitted to the verdict.

This significant difference in the results of the investigation itself confirms that the case was investigated with an approach based on individual criminal responsibility and that mere presence in gatherings or connection with an event did not automatically lead to the issuance of a single sentence for all individuals.

2. Regarding the role of Mr. Shervin Bagherian in the events of Alikhani Square

Following the call of groups, individuals and media hostile to the Islamic Republic of Iran in January 2026, riots called the riots of Shahid Alikhani Square occurred in Isfahan, Malek Shahr, which resulted in the martyrdom of four security guards of the Special Police Unit (FARAJA). These people were beaten in a very brutal manner, including with numerous blows with knives, machetes, axes and other sharp objects and hard objects, and their bodies were dismembered and in some cases burned alive and abandoned. Mr. Shervin Bagherian was also among the people who, according to the contents of the case file and the investigations conducted (12 volumes of the case file), contacted his friends and invited them to participate in the riots. In his call, he announces that he intends to avenge his cousin, [REDACTED] who was arrested in the previous days during the riots. According to the contents of the videos recorded on the CCTV cameras and also the videos taken by the accused himself on his mobile phone, he was present in Shahid Alikhani Square and, while stabbing a security officer and inciting and encouraging others to set the officers on fire, he poured gasoline on one of the officers and burned him. According to one of the videos taken by Mr. Bagherian, he shouts: "Don't kill them, instead, set them on fire". According to the same videos taken, he also encourages others to set the bus station on fire and pour gasoline on the injured officers. In part of the videos recorded by the defendant himself, he is standing on the ventilation unit next to the subway, filming himself and the other rioters present at the crime scene, next to the burned bodies of the officers and the destructions, stating: "Brother [REDACTED] we have avenged you, and God willing, [the rest will be] for after the Revolution".

3. Regarding the claim of a short trial and lack of sufficient opportunity for defense

In the present correspondence, it has been understood that the trial of individuals, including Mr. Bagherian, was summary proceedings. This understanding is not consistent with the official information in the case.

The case was referred to the court on February 18, 2026 and the first hearing was held on April 4, 2026. The hearings lasted for five consecutive days, from April 4, 2026 to April 8, 2026,

No:

Date:

and were held every day from 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. In addition, more than 100 pages of minutes were prepared during these hearings, and the proceedings were recorded and filmed by the Media Center of the Judiciary. Therefore, the description of the judicial process in this case as summary proceedings is not consistent with the facts and official information in the case.

The Islamic Republic of Iran also emphasizes that the length of the proceedings alone is not a criterion for ensuring a fair trial, and what is important is the provision of a real and effective opportunity for defense and observance of the guarantees provided for in the law. Official information on the case indicates that multiple hearings have been held and the defenses of the defendants' lawyers, including Mr. Shervin Bagherian, have also been examined in the judicial process.

4. Regarding Mr. Bagherian's access to a lawyer and defense guarantees

One of the main themes of the correspondence is the claim that Mr. Bagherian was denied access to a selected lawyer and was unable to prepare a defense. This claim does not correspond to the official information in the case file.

According to the official report of the Isfahan Provincial Justice Department, all defendants related to the Alikhani Square incident, including Mr. Bagherian, had court-appointed counsel at the prosecution stage. Following the referral of the case to the court, the defendants also proceeded to introduce counsel of their own choosing. The counsel introduced had the opportunity to study the case file prior to the first court hearing and, according to the judicial authority, raised no objection with regard to having studied the case file and being prepared to mount a defense. These lawyers attended the hearings and also submitted their defense briefs, to the extent that the totality of the defense briefs submitted constituted a separate volume of the case file. Furthermore, the process of making use of lawyers continued after the issuance of the judgments, and some of the convicted persons and their lawyers sought to re-examine the case file and make use of the legal means of objection and retrial.

Mr. Bagherian changed several lawyers during the preliminary investigations at the prosecution stage and the proceedings before the court, and in many of the investigations, he recorded in his own handwriting the changes of counsel of his own choosing. Accordingly, the claim that the defendants, including Mr. Bagherian, were "deprived" of access to counsel of their choice is not consistent with the official information available.

5. Regarding individual criminal responsibility and the claim of collective responsibility

In the correspondence of the Special Procedures, concerns have been raised regarding the failure to establish the individual responsibility of each of the convicted persons and the possibility of the application of collective responsibility. The Islamic Republic of Iran emphasizes in this regard that

the plurality of defendants in a case does not mean that their charges, evidence, or criminal responsibility are identical.

In the case under discussion, preliminary investigations were conducted with respect to the individuals, and the court, on the basis of a body of evidence and documentation, including reports of the law enforcement authorities, the investigations conducted, the content extracted from mobile phones, the reconstruction of the scene of the crime, statements of witnesses, and other available documentation, made a determination regarding the charges brought against them.

As previously mentioned, the differing outcomes of the judicial proceedings with respect to the defendants also confirm this matter. If the basis of the judgments had been merely membership in a group, presence at a gathering, or collective responsibility arising from an incident, the issuance of differing judgments, ranging from acquittal and imprisonment to execution, could not be explained. Therefore, the Islamic Republic of Iran does not agree with the view that the judgments issued were based on collective responsibility and without examination of the role of each individual.

6. Regarding the nature of the charges and the distinction between peaceful protest and acts of violence

One of the important points in assessing this case is the necessity of distinguishing between peaceful acts within the framework of individuals' legal rights and the commission of violent and criminal acts.

According to the official information in the case file, the incidents at Shahid Alikhani Square were not limited merely to the presence of individuals at a gathering; rather, during these incidents, widespread destruction of public and private property, infliction of injuries on individuals, and ultimately the killing of four law enforcement officers occurred. According to the official information in the case file, the charges that resulted in the issuance of death sentences concerned specific conduct and violent acts attributed to the convicted persons, rather than merely their presence at a gathering or protest. From this perspective, describing the case in a manner suggesting that the individuals faced the death penalty solely because of their participation in peaceful protests does not provide a complete picture of the matter.

The Islamic Republic of Iran emphasizes that the right to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly is respected; however, these rights cannot be regarded as a cover for the commission of acts that are considered crimes under the law, including killing, infliction of serious injuries upon persons, or violent destruction of property. Criminal responsibility arising from such acts must be examined on the basis of the law and upon the establishment of the individual responsibility of the persons concerned.

7. Regarding the claim of the use of forced confessions and torture

The communication contains allegations concerning torture, coercion, and the use of confessions obtained under pressure. The Islamic Republic of Iran does not confirm these allegations if they are regarded as established facts with respect to the case.

The prohibition of torture and coercion of an accused person for the purpose of obtaining a confession is expressly recognized under the laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Article 38 of the Constitution prohibits any form of torture for obtaining a confession or acquiring information and considers confessions or testimony resulting from coercion to be invalid. Furthermore, Article 578 of the Islamic Penal Code establishes criminal liability for officials who subject an accused person to ill-treatment for the purpose of obtaining a confession. In addition, the Law on Respecting Legitimate Freedoms and Safeguarding Citizens' Rights prohibits any form of torture and ill-treatment of an accused person for the purpose of obtaining a confession.

Therefore, the legal system of the Islamic Republic of Iran not only does not permit such conduct, but also provides for legal liability for those who commit it.

In the event that any specific, attributable, and substantiated allegation concerning unlawful conduct by officials is raised, the matter will be examined through the competent domestic authorities. The mere assertion of an allegation in media sources or secondary reports, without its establishment by a competent authority, cannot constitute a basis for a definitive conclusion regarding the manner in which the accused person was treated.

8. Regarding the statements broadcast by the media and their connection to the judicial judgment

Another aspect of the communication concerns the broadcasting by the media of statements attributed to Mr. Bagherian and the possibility that the said statements were obtained under coercion and relied upon in the judicial process.

In this regard, it is necessary to distinguish between the media broadcasting of a defendant's statements and the judicial basis for issuing the judgment. According to the official information in the case file, the court did not rely solely on one source or one type of evidence in assessing the charges; rather, a body of documentation, including reports of the Police of Information and Security, preliminary investigations, the contents of mobile phones, reconstruction of the crime scene, statements of witnesses, statements of the defendants, and other evidence in the case file, were examined.

Therefore, the mere publication or broadcasting by the media of part of a defendant's statements does not, in itself, mean that the judicial judgment was issued solely or exclusively on the basis of those statements.

Furthermore, the claim that confessions were obtained under torture or coercive treatment is not confirmed, based on the official information available. It is self-evident that, in the judicial system of the Islamic Republic of Iran, any evidence obtained through unlawful conduct cannot constitute a legitimate basis for issuing a judgment.

9. Regarding the stages of challenging the judgments and their judicial review

According to the judgment issued, Mr. Shervin Bagherian has been sentenced to death for acts against the physical integrity of individuals and against national security in a manner that has resulted in severe disruption of public order and the creation of insecurity on a wide scale, as well as for his other criminal acts, including incitement to war and killing, conspiracy to act against national security, propagandist activities against the system, and membership in a group against national security, and in view of the fact that he was carrying a weapon and inflicted injuries on officers at the place where the offense was committed. At present, following the appeal by the convicted person and his lawyers of his own choosing, the case is pending before the Supreme Court for review of the appeal on cassation and has not yet become final.

With regard to the other convicted persons, following the issuance of the death sentences, these persons and their counsel of their own choosing appealed the judgments issued, and the case was sent to the Supreme Court for review. The Supreme Court, after examining the case, has upheld the judgments issued in respect of some of them. Therefore, the judgments in question were not merely the result of an initial decision by the trial court, but were also reviewed by the highest judicial authority within the framework of the mechanisms for challenging and judicial review provided for in the criminal procedure system of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Furthermore, with regard to legal remedies available after the judgment becomes final, as applicable, the mechanisms provided for under the laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran, including retrial and other extraordinary means of review, may be considered. It is self-evident that the possibility of resorting to any of these means is subject to the conditions and requirements prescribed by law and the particular circumstances of each case.

10. Regarding the status of the execution of the judgments

With regard to the status of the execution of the judgments, it is also necessary to take into consideration accurate and official information concerning the status of each of the convicted persons and to avoid generalizing the status of one individual to the others.

According to the latest information provided by Isfahan Provincial Justice Department, among the 12 persons sentenced to death, the judgments in respect of four persons have been executed. With regard to the other convicted persons, the judicial status of each individual should be examined on the basis of the latest official and case-specific information relating to the relevant case. Accordingly, the status of Mr. Bagherian should also be assessed on the basis of the latest official information concerning him personally, and not merely on the basis of media reports or by generalizing the status of other convicted persons.

11. Regarding reliance on Article 6 of the Covenant and “most serious crimes”

As a State Party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Islamic Republic of Iran takes into consideration its obligations within the framework of the legal provisions and requirements arising therefrom. However, the interpretation and application of the provisions of the Covenant in relation to criminal cases must be undertaken with due regard to the facts of each case, the nature of the charges, and the establishment of the individual responsibility of the accused.

In the present case, as explained, the death sentences referred to in the communication concern the alleged commission of violent acts resulting in the killing of four law enforcement officers, and not merely participation in a gathering or protest. Therefore, the general characterization of the case as the imposition of the death penalty on individuals solely on account of their participation in protests is not consistent with the official information in the case file.

Furthermore, the Islamic Republic of Iran emphasizes that the determination of the elements of an offense, the assessment of evidence, and the establishment of the criminal responsibility of individuals fall within the jurisdiction of the competent judicial authority, and that a judicial decision must be made on the basis of the evidence and documentation contained in the case file.

12. Regarding the allegation of “enforced disappearance”

It has been alleged in the communication that Mr. Bagherian was inaccessible for a period of one week following his arrest and that this constitutes a case of “enforced disappearance”.

In this regard, the Islamic Republic of Iran emphasizes that the mere lack of access by the family or third parties to an individual at a particular point in time, without examining the legal status of the detention, the place of detention, judicial orders, and other relevant facts, cannot automatically constitute a basis for establishing the legal characterization of “enforced disappearance”.

It is self-evident that, should specific and substantiated information concerning the person’s detention status or place of detention be available, it should be examined on the basis of official

information and through the competent authorities. The Islamic Republic of Iran is also prepared to examine information concerning the judicial status of individuals within the framework of the applicable legal mechanisms and relevant jurisdictions.

13. Regarding security-related criminal offenses and the principle of legality of crimes and punishments

The communication of the Special Procedures has also raised general concerns regarding security-related criminal offenses, including *Moharebeh*, *Baghy*, and *Efsad fel-Arz*, and has called for the amendment or repeal of certain provisions. In this regard, it should be recalled that the criminal offenses and punishments prescribed under the laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran have been established within the framework of the country's legislative process, and their application is also subject to the conditions and elements prescribed by law. The determination of whether the elements of each criminal offense have been satisfied is also a judicial matter that must be undertaken with due regard to the specific conduct attributed to the accused and the evidence available in the case file.

Accordingly, the mere existence of a criminal offense in domestic law cannot be understood to mean that any conduct related to protest or political or social activity falls within that offense. What is important in each case is the specific conduct attributed to the individual, the evidence establishing it, and the determination by the competent judicial authority that the legal elements of the offense have been satisfied.

14. Final remarks

The Islamic Republic of Iran once again emphasizes that, in assessing judicial cases, particularly cases involving complex and sensitive dimensions, it is necessary to distinguish between the official information in the case file and media reports or secondary information.

As has also been explained with respect to the case concerning the incidents at Shahid Alikhani Square, certain published allegations regarding the number of defendants, absolute deprivation of access to counsel, the brevity of the proceedings, the failure to examine individual responsibility, and the use of confessions obtained under torture are not consistent with the official information available to the judicial authorities.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, while respecting the concerns raised by the Special Procedures, maintains that human rights assessments concerning judicial cases should be based on accurate, reliable, and verifiable information and should take into consideration all stages of the judicial process. Adopting positions on the basis of incomplete information or media reports, particularly in cases where the criminal responsibility of individuals must be established individually, may result in an inaccurate portrayal of the facts of the case.

At the same time, the Islamic Republic of Iran emphasizes its commitment to respecting the legal rights of individuals, ensuring a fair trial, prohibiting torture and conduct contrary to human dignity, and respecting the defense rights of accused persons. The laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran have also provided for multiple legal mechanisms to guarantee these rights and address potential violations.

Finally, the Islamic Republic of Iran, while respecting the mandate and competences of the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council, declares its readiness and determination to continue constructive engagement and cooperation with the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations and emphasizes the importance of dialogue based on mutual respect, accurate and objective information, and avoidance of prejudgment regarding judicial cases.

It is hoped that the foregoing explanations will be taken into consideration in the assessment of the case of Mr. Shervin Bagherian Jabeli and in providing a more accurate reflection of the judicial status of the case.